

REMARKS

This is in response to the prior final rejection in this case. Applicant does not agree. The Examiner contends that Ramachandran makes change. That is not a correct interpretation of Ramachandran. Rather, Ramachandran provides notes that can be used as change. The only mention of change in Ramachandran is in column 41, lines 25-35 which state: "In some embodiments the controller may operate to provide the merchant user with messages prompting the user to indicate the number and denomination of notes they wish to receive. This may be valuable to a merchant user who requires particular denominations of notes from the machine to carry out the efficient operation of their business, such as for making change. Various approaches to presenting merchant users with withdrawal options may be provided in embodiments of the invention through programming of a controller which controls operation of the machine." (Emphasis added). Thus there is no teaching, description, or suggestion of the note acceptor-dispenser validator system that accepts a dispense change instruction and dispenses notes and coins as change as set out in amended claims 26-29.

In addition, the combination does not disclose the note hopper/change dispenser called out in the amended claims. The recycler 80 of Katou is not a note hopper/change dispenser. Instead, the recycler of Katou is only to back out of transactions and to return notes to a user who changes his mind about depositing them into an ATM. Because the prior art fails to teach this structural element, these independent claims are distinct from the cited combination and are thus patentable.

New Claims

Applicant believes that the new claims 31-35, are distinct over the current prior art cited in this case. Applicants contends that the combination suggested by the Examiner fails to disclose a note acceptor-dispenser validator disposed in a location for a note validator. All of the cited references require extensive additional structure in addition to the note validator that is disclosed in the references. For Example, Ramachandran is an ATM machine for use

in a convenience store or other such environment. There is no teaching, description, or suggestion in Ramachandran of placing the ATM in a location in a vending machine that previously held the bill validator. Nor could such teaching exist as Ramachandran is a full size ATM and could not be used to retrofit into an existing vending machine.

Similarly, Katou does not provide the necessary teaching to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to replace a bill validator with a note acceptor-dispenser validator as called out in the independent claims.

Finally, Graef is directed to an automated transaction machine that includes a sheet dispensing path verification system and method. The machine includes a sheet handling mechanism (17, 192) therein, including a sheet transport path (42). Devices for sensing and moving sheets are positioned adjacent to the transport path. Like Ramachandran, Graef is a full size ATM and could does not teach, describe, or suggest disposing it in a location formerly receiving a bill validator.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims are allowable over the references and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any comments or questions with respect to the foregoing, he is invited to contact the undersigned counsel of record for the applicant.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 595-3023. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 31, 2009



J.D. Harriman II, Reg. 31,967

DLA Piper US LLP
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 400
Los Angeles, California 90067-6023
Tel: (310) 595-3000
Fax: (310) 595-3300